

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

JOHN DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

REVATURE LLC, ET AL

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01399-TL

APPLICATION FOR COURT-APPOINTED
COUNSEL IN TITLE VII ACTION

NOTED FOR DETERMINATION ON
NOVEMBER 4TH, 2022

MOTION EX PARTE

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court appoint counsel to represent him/her pursuant of 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(1). This is an action alleging employment discrimination and seeking relief under Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as codified, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12112 to 12117.

FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT

This Court has previously granted me leave to proceed in forma pauperis and the financial situation has not changed. The previously submitted financial affidavit (Dkt. No. 1) still applies.

APPLICATION FOR COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL IN TITLE VII ACTION

PREVIOUS EFFORTS TO RETAIN AN ATTORNEY

Beginning in April I have contacted more than a dozen employment attorneys in Seattle, mostly through the Washington Employment Lawyers Association at WELA.org, but also utilizing Avvo.com, Findlaw.com, and referrals from the King County Bar Association. There was quite a bit of interest but ultimately none of the attorneys I followed up with were willing to take the case on a contingency basis.

MERITS OF CLAIM

The EEOC's Washington (DC) Field Office has declined to make any determination in this case, even after I provided evidence that should have made it clear that Revature has lied repeatedly in its response to the agency. Every employment attorney I have spoken to in Virginia and Seattle has agreed there are valid ADA claims in this case, yet it has not met their threshold of interest for contingency cases for various business-related reasons.

In support of the merits of this case, I can assure the Court there are multiple easily provable disclosures of ADA protected medical information, multiple instances of objective harassment provable by surrounding facts if not video evidence, verifiable discriminatory decisions and threats of retaliation, all of which the company purposefully ignored for over 2 months before terminating my employment.

This has caused a lot of grief for me personally, but to my mind the more important merits of the case are in the public interest aspect. Revature's actions reveal a company policy that willfully disregards US civil rights law. As I have pointed out to the EEOC, Revature has yet to provide any meaningful denial of the allegations and has instead responded only with

1 deliberate obfuscation and false statements; aiding, abetting, and libel as a matter of course. This
2 is known as “reckless and egregious indifference” under the ADA and will be undeniable once
3 the facts are before the Court.
4

5 Because I expect Revature to move to dismiss this case with reference to the arbitration
6 clause in our employment contract, and because I believe this to be repugnant to the public
7 interest, these points will likely be argued at length fairly soon. I would certainly benefit from
8 the help of a capable employment attorney and beg the Court to grant appointment of such —
9 and not just for my own sake.
10
11

12 **AUTHORIZATION FOR RELEASE OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF THE**
13 **CIVIL RIGHTS CASE SCREENING COMMITTEE**

14 I hereby authorize the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Washington
15 State Human Rights Commission to furnish to members of the Federal Civil Rights Case
16 Screening Committee and to any attorney subsequently selected by the Court to represent me
17 with a copy of the files maintained by them in connection with my complaint of discrimination.
18
19

20 I, John Doe, plaintiff in this action, swear that I have read this entire Application,
21 including any attachments, and the Complaint. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare
22 under penalty of perjury that the foregoing information is true and correct.
23

24 Dated this **16th day of October, 2022.**
25

26 
27
28

JOHN DOE
Plaintiff, *pro se*